

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-9, 12-16 and 18-24 are pending in the application after entry of this amendment. Claims 1, 4-8, 15 and 16 were previously allowed. Claims 11-13 were objected to. By this amendment, independent claim 9 is amended to include the limitations of objected to claim 11 and intervening claim 10, with claims 10 and 11 being canceled, so that claim 9 should now be allowed. The dependency of claim 12 is amended to depend from claim 9. Claims 12-14 should also be allowed.

Claims 18-24 were provisionally rejected based on obviousness type double patenting. Submitted herewith are a statement under 37 CFR 3.373(b) and a Terminal Disclaimer to obviate a provisional double patenting rejection over a pending second application. The rejection should be withdrawn and claims 18-24 allowed.

The drawing objection has been addressed in a separately filed request for approval of drawing change in which reference numeral 115 is deleted from Fig. 1.

Applicant traverses the objection to the disclosure. The disclosure is not inconsistent. Figs. 6 and 7, and the related disclosure at page 12, lines 8-16, describe how it can be determined if a movable contact is incorrectly inserted in the pusher assembler. When correctly assembled, as shown in Fig. 7, the movable contact makes contact with the stationary contacts. If incorrectly assembled, as shown in Fig. 6, contact is not made. The presence of a second movable contact is not inconsistent. In order to have a second movable contact, the first movable contact would be oriented as shown in Fig. 6, the second movable contact would be oriented as shown in Fig. 7, with

the central portions of each being back to back and in contact with one another. In such a situation, the contacts are correctly inserted in the pusher assembly. A test of the pusher assembly would not be necessary. What the specification teaches is that with a single contact, as shown in Figs. 6 and 7, if the movable contact is incorrectly inserted, then that fact can be detected. Whether or not a similar result follows if two movable contacts are inserted is irrelevant as the specification does not address that situation. Indeed, all of the drawing figures illustrate a single movable contact. The reference at page 12, lines 3 and 4, simply indicates that two movable contacts can be placed back to back into the pusher. That fact does not preclude testing for incorrect assembly when a single contact is used.

Reconsideration of the application and allowance and passage to issue are requested.

Respectfully submitted,



F. William McLaughlin
Reg. No. 32,273

Date: October 21, 2003

WOOD, PHILLIPS, KATZ,
CLARK AND MORTIMER
Citicorp Center, Suite 3800
500 W. Madison Street
Chicago, IL 60661-2511
(312) 876-1800